

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 23, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Claims 1-48 were pending prior to the instant amendment, of which claims 17-48 have been withdrawn from consideration. By this amendment, claims 1-15 are amended and claims 17-48 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 49-54 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Consequently, claims 1-16 and 49-54 are currently pending for consideration in the instant application, of which claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15 are independent.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 7 and 10-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,670,773 to Nakamura et al. (Nakamura) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,451,636 to Segawa et al. (Segawa); claims 2, 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nakamura and Segawa as applied to claims 2, 4 and 7 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,229,310 to Sivan (Sivan); and claims 3, 6 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nakamura and Segawa as applied to claims 2, 4 and 7 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,595 to Gosain et al. (Gosain). These rejections are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

With respect to independent claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15, the Examiner asserts that Nakamura, taken in combination with Segawa, makes obvious the claimed invention. However, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15 to recite, *inter alia*, the features of “wherein a channel of the second thin film transistor is folded and orients in a plurality of directions” and/or “wherein a channel of the driving thin film transistor is folded

and orients in a plurality of directions.” (See, for example, FIGS. 2A and 3B). That is, the channel of the driving film transistor of the present invention is **folded within** a pixel. These features facilitate the design and production of a thin film transistor (TFT) having a large ratio of the channel length to the gate width. In contrast, Nakamura (as admitted by the Examiner on page 3 of the office action) fails to teach such a technical feature. Further, Applicants contend that Segawa also fails to teach or suggest such a technical feature. Segawa appears to merely teach or suggest that the display device have a plurality of TFTs and that the directions of all of the channels of the plurality of TFTs are not identical to each other. In other words, it appears that Segawa fails to teach or suggest the feature of wherein a channel of the second thin film transistor is **folded** and orients in a plurality of directions, as presently claimed. Thus, it cannot be said that Nakamura, taken in combination with Segawa, make obvious the present invention, as claimed.

Additionally, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15 to similarly recite, among other things, the features of “a first thin film transistor, a second thin film transistor, and a third thin film transistor; a first gate signal line, and a second gate signal line, a source signal line, and a current supply line, wherein a gate of the first thin film transistor is electrically connected to the first gate signal line and a second terminal of the third thin film transistor, wherein a first terminal of the first thin film transistor is electrically connected to the source signal line, wherein a second terminal of the first thin film transistor is electrically connected to a gate of the second thin film transistor and a first terminal of the third thin film transistor, wherein a first terminal of the second thin film transistor is electrically connected to the current supply line, wherein a second terminal of the second thin film transistor is electrically connected to the light emitting element, wherein a second terminal of the third thin film transistor is electrically connected to the first gate signal line,

wherein a gate of the third thin film transistor is electrically connected to the second gate signal line.” These limitations focus on the configuration of the pixel. Namely, as shown in the amended independent claims, Applicants added technical features disclosed in Figure 4A in which three thin film transistors (1506 to 1507), first and second gate signal lines (1502, 1503), a source signal line, and a current supply line are clearly demonstrated.

The Examiner attempts further to remedy the deficiencies of Nakamura and Segawa by turning to Sivan. The Examiner asserts that Sivan discusses that channel length is determined by gate width which can vary (col. 6, lines 45-57). However, Sivan does not disclose or suggest the features of a channel of the second thin film transistor is folded and orients in a plurality of directions and/or the technical features of three thin film transistors, first and second gate signal lines, a source signal line and a current supply line, as similarly recited in claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15.

The Examiner attempts further to remedy the deficiencies of Nakamura and Segawa by turning to Gosain. The Examiner asserts that Gosain discusses using an irradiated energy beam to form a semiconductor layer (col. 11, lines 20-36)¹. However, Gosain does not disclose or suggest the features of a channel of the second thin film transistor is folded and orients in a plurality of directions and/or the technical features of three thin film transistors, first and second gate signal lines, a source signal line and a current supply line, as similarly recited in claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15.

In accordance with the M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In*

¹ The Examiner appears to accidentally recite the teachings of Sivan on page 10 of the Office Action but recites the proper section of Gosain.

re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Nakamura, Segawa, Sivan nor Gosain, taken alone or in any proper combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter as recited in claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Please note that minor amendments were carried out in several dependent and independent claims in order to revise claim informality or correct grammatical errors. Also, new claims 49-53 were added which limit the polarity of the transistors. The support for these new claims may be found in Figure 4A, for example.

Each of the dependent claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 14 or 15 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 1, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15.

In addition, each of the dependent claims also recite combinations that are separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this claimed invention, as amended, is not rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore request the entry of this response, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In discussing the specification, claims, and drawings in this response, it is to be understood that Applicant in no way intends to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary embodiments described in the specification and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicant is entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned agent at (202) 585-8100.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. #48103/
Sean A. Pryor

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080